

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

|                               |   |           |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------|
| MAJEED ASSAR,                 | ) |           |
|                               | ) |           |
| Plaintiff,                    | ) |           |
|                               | ) |           |
| v.                            | ) | 1:10CV647 |
|                               | ) |           |
| CAROLYN W. COLVIN,            | ) |           |
| Acting Commissioner of Social | ) |           |
| Security,                     | ) |           |
|                               | ) |           |
| Defendant.                    | ) |           |

**ORDER**

This matter is before this court for review of the Memorandum Opinion and Recommendation ("Recommendation") filed on February 6, 2015, by the Magistrate Judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). (Doc. 16.) In the Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Commissioner's decision finding no disability be affirmed, that Plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings (Doc. 10) be denied, that Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings (Doc. 13) be granted, and that this action be dismissed with prejudice. The Recommendation was served on the parties to this action on February 6, 2015 (Doc. 17). Counsel for Plaintiff filed timely

objections (Doc. 18) to the Recommendation and counsel for the Commissioner filed a response to the objections (Doc. 19).

This court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [Magistrate Judge's] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the [M]agistrate [J]udge. . . . [O]r recommit the matter to the [M]agistrate [J]udge with instructions." Id.

This court has appropriately reviewed the portions of the Recommendation to which objection was made and has made a de novo determination which is in accord with the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation. This court therefore adopts the Recommendation.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation (Doc. 16) is **ADOPTED**. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings (Doc. 10) is **DENIED**, that Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings (Doc. 13) is **GRANTED**, that the Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**, and that this action be dismissed with prejudice.

A Judgment dismissing this action will be entered contemporaneously with this Order.

This the 11th day of March, 2015.

*William L. Ostun, Jr.*

---

United States District Judge